

1312 Elon Rd.
Henrico, Virginia 23229

July 7, 2019

Mr. Damon Duncan
President and Chief Executive Officer
RRHA
901 Chamberlayne Parkway,
Richmond, Virginia 23220

Mr. Duncan:

I am writing to express concern with RRHA's approach to moving from its current model to the Rental Assistance Demonstration (RAD) program.

While RAD programs continue to use taxpayer funds to provide housing opportunities to low-income citizens, they often do so at the expense of transparency, accountability, and community input, while also creating hurdles for those most in need of housing. We can look to 2017 media coverage of Hopewell, Virginia's transition to RAD for examples of house residents were mistreated and how it played out in the legal system and in the public eye.

It's my opinion that converting to a public-private model is not ideal. However, should RRHA move forward with conversion to this approach, it's also my opinion that it 1:1 replacement of units should be developed and that all current residents should be provided with transition services and an opportunity to occupy one of the new units. I also request that the suggested 2020 Annual Plan revert to prior language that requires decisions regarding these properties to be evaluated by HUD, RRHA tenants, the Richmond Tenants' Organization, and the Board of Commissioners.

Approximately 5% of Richmond City's most in-need citizens count on these homes for their shelter. It is my hope that as you continue to transition into this role that you serve and listen to our most vulnerable neighbors before serving seeking to serve the interests of developers and powerful decision makers.

Kind regards,

Melissa McKenney



**NICHOLAS
DA SILVA**
Our voice for Richmond 5th

July 8th, 2019

To the Board of RRHA,

I am writing to you to strongly urge against the adoption of the proposed demolition and conversion of public housing outlined in the "Five Year Agency Plan for Fiscal Years 2019-2024." The proposed solutions to meet housing needs pose a significant risk to the wellbeing of the working class and Richmond's most at-risk families. If the proposed changes to public housing were approved our city would suffer from the same failures of other mixed-finance redevelopment projects. The proposed plan displaces current occupants and presents them two options, either wait for the privatized housing "*replacements*" to their former public housing or attempt to find housing in the private market. Both options hurt occupants, yet, both options benefit developers.

Demolishing public housing and converting public housing to an assistance-based system will displace thousands of residents living in poverty, uncap rent rates across the Greater Richmond Region, and line the pockets of private developers who aspire to segregate our city through gentrification. Moreover, every problem caused by the conversion of public housing to mixed-finance housing will disproportionately affect Black residents, as Black residents constitute 61.2 percent of Richmonders of those living at or below the federal poverty rate.

The destruction of public housing courts throughout the city will naturally lead to a massive displacement of families and single people. This displacement will exacerbate Richmond's already disastrous eviction crisis. Richmond suffers from one of the highest eviction rates amongst large U.S. cities. One in nine people were evicted in the city in 2016. Occupants of the demolished public housing suddenly forced to take on additional living expenses will then enter an unequal private housing market. Government assistance from HUD or RRHA will not protect former public housing occupants from the hostile landlords or predatory lenders. Finding new housing is also not a guarantee. Although illegal, former occupants can be discriminated against and denied housing based on their Section 8 status. The most likely scenario for former occupants is to fall further into poverty.

The addition of thousands of new renters into the private market will additionally reduce competition in the housing market and free landlords from a prohibiting factor to the rate of rent. With public housing no longer creating a bottom for the accepted market standard of rent, the rate of rent will increase significantly. New competition amongst tenants to secure the limit amount of housing made available by landlords will price out renters in the private market who struggled to find affordable housing. According to the U.S. Census Bureau, 25.2 percent of Richmonders live at or below the poverty line. An increase in rent prices spurred



**NICHOLAS
DA SILVA**
Our voice for Richmond 5th

by landlords capitalizing on the influx of individuals seeking housing will force many into homelessness.

The contracts RRHA is soliciting private investments to fund new projects will not serve to make low-income housing more readily available. However, rewarding private developers with building projects will increase the profits for the private developers.

New developments undertaken by private enterprises will also bring additional efforts to gentrify Richmond. Increasing rents, evictions, and cultural eradication will tear apart working-class neighborhoods, bulldozing the wealth of families and individuals, all while bringing public and private dollars alike into the pockets of for-profit companies. Gentrification will inevitably be a result of the privatization of public housing.

Furthermore, the act of removing public housing overwhelmingly affects African-Americans, a trend which tracks with our city's past. To cite Richmonder, Dr. Tressie McMillan Cottom, from an interview with Richmond Magazine, "Richmond is fortuitous because it has benefited from black labor and never really had to give black people credit for it." Enslavement, Black Codes, redlining, and gentrification are simply some of the tactics employed in a long history of exploitation. We cannot be complicit in removing wealth from more Black communities.

The engagement of affected families and individuals has been minimal. Few tenants were present at the public feedback meeting and the subsequent mail-in or physical-feedback public comment process has proven burdensome, creating additional layers of complexity, further negating the voices of occupants and applicants. In totality, the comment and petition process is fundamentally undemocratic. Those who struggle to find housing security will be made homeless for the benefit of private interests, all without the consent of the majority.

Please consider the ramifications of this plan for the working class of Richmond. Privatization is not the solution to the housing crisis; keep our public housing public.

Sincerely,

Nicholas Da Silva
Candidate for Richmond's 5th City Council District

Eric Sundberg
Campaign Manager
Eric Sundberg

(RRHA Commissioners)

July 8, 2019

To Whom it may concern

I am not a public housing resident, but live near Gilpin Court complex.

I understand that residents are to receive vouchers in this transition from public housing. In theory, this is great, but my concern is the misunderstandings of their next steps.

Are vouchers immediately received or is there a waiting list? I have heard several versions of how persons will be transitioned to other properties.

One of the greatest injustices humans face is the dignity or lack of dignity shown public housing residents.

Many issues have surfaced during the course of their residency, pertaining to property management, but you received their funds anyway... which provided income on bonds. I truly would like to see Richmond City lead the way in transitioning with dignity residents to better housing immediately without media highlighting the ills of the transition.

Another point of concern is whether you are forcing this population into the counties or

outside of the state and create a lowered
populus for the city and an auto price tax
hike on amenities of the remaining residents.

Please make your priority

- transitioning persons with dignity
by immediate vouchers - no long
waiting lists.
- provide assistance in property location
for those that would need assistance
- help Dickinson stand for something
positive out of it all.
- = If 1 for 1 replacement is not offered
then find agencies to contract to
help find relocation in the city
Keep our numbers up! If we are
not careful, Mexico may become
the new capital city - with all the
federal funds to support them.

Marlyn Campbell
northlightpub@gmail.com

Who benefits? Who decides?

RRHA silences residents, voting for massive displacement

RRHA has released a proposal—outlined in pages 28-34 of RRHA's 2019-2020 Annual Agency Plan—to demolish Richmond's public housing courts without good-faith engagement or brick-and-mortar replacement for current tenants. The public can comment on the proposal this week. Despite the high stakes of these actions, RRHA has made little effort to engage tenants or the broader public in evaluating these proposals:

- While RRHA held a public meeting, it made no substantive effort to engage residents.
- Due to minimal resident engagement by RRHA, only a few tenants were in attendance—those residents were informed through grassroots tenant organizing, not the Authority or its staff.
- Following its poorly publicized meetings, the Authority has limited feedback on its proposals to a paper mail-in process, creating an unnecessary burden for stakeholders and a delay in submission.

Without publicized robust community engagement, this proposal is both undemocratic and a violation of the rights of public housing tenants to “be involved and participate in the overall policy development and direction of public housing operations” (title 24; section 964, *Code of Federal Regulations*).

The lack of resident input in public housing governance is widely recognized by advocacy organizations like the Right to the City Alliance as a private-sector mechanism for eliminating secure housing for low-income residents in favor of unaffordable rental units with high eviction rates. These policies fuel displacement and disproportionately target African-American, working-class, and working-poor residents.

This rapid-fire elimination of Richmond's most affordable housing will destroy communities and create a crisis. Our waitlist for public housing access is already overburdened. Our city lacks sufficient housing and we have one of the highest private-housing eviction rates in the country.

Public housing elimination and replacement with privately subsidized housing, will have a devastating effect on our public school system, where some of our least-resourced schools serve children and families who currently reside in our public housing neighborhoods. A sudden spike in housing insecurity will leave families who are scrambling to locate housing unsure of their enrollment status in a school district with limited resources to support parents in navigating our open enrollment process.

In our neighborhoods and in our schools, the actions proposed by our housing authority will increase housing insecurity and compound our city's history of institutional racism. The disproportionate African-American residents of Richmond's public housing have a right to the city their ancestors built.

RRHA must honor public process and public feedback in its 2019-2020 plan.

Kristin Reed
Richmond, 7th District

Lafonda Page
Richmond, 7th District

Gary Broderick
Richmond, 7th District

Jasmine Leeward
Richmond, 7th District

Nicolas DaSilva
Richmond
5th District City Council
Candidate

Thomas Burkett
Virginia River Healers
Richmond, 3rd District

Qiana Richards
Richmond, 6th District

Alexander Sparrow
DSA Richmond
Richmond, 2nd District

Nathan Arries
Richmond, VA

Laura Goren
Richmond, 6th District

Donna Joyce
Parent & Advocate
Richmond, 3rd District

Amy Wentz
Richmond, 8th District

Jesse Goldstein
Richmond, 3rd District
Christopher Romero
Richmond, 7th District

Alex Wagaman
Richmond, 1st District

Marty Jewell
Former Richmond City
Councilman
Richmond, 7th District

Wendy Boyton
Richmond, 7th District

Laura McCann
Richmond, 3rd District

Kate Baltes
Richmond, 5th District

James Randall
Richmond, 5th District

Kristen Tate
Richmond, VA

Charles Peters
Richmond, 1st District

Haya Hamid
Richmond, 7th District

Elsa Rios
Richmond, 1st District

Maya Walters
Richmond, 2nd District

Martha Roberts
Richmond, 3rd District

Brian Knox
Richmond, 3rd District

Ashley Smith
Richmond, 2nd District

Ben Himmelfarb
Richmond 1st District

Debbie Rowe
Richmond, 3rd District

Eric Sundberg
Richmond, 5th District

Erek Jones
Richmond, 1st District

Anneliese Grant
Richmond, 5th District

Paige Bailey
Richmond, 7th District

Seth Hatmaker
Richmond, Va

Suzanne Keller
Richmond, 4th District

Andrea Bryant
Richmond, 6th District

Will Kerner
Richmond, 2nd District

Nathan Jamerson
Richmond, 1st District

DarShee Clark
Richmond, 7th District

Sarah Pedersen
Richmond, 7th District

Jessica Shim
Richmond, 4th District

Isabel Eljaiek
Richmond, 7th District

Nicholas Buffin
Richmond, 5th District

Brett Sprouse
Richmond, 2nd District

Jaylynne West,
Richmond, Va

Jeremy Hoffman
Richmond, 2nd District

Whitney Whiting
Richmond, 4th District

Samuel West
Richmond, 8th District

Dolores Fitzgerald
Richmond, 5th District

Amanda Long
Richmond, 5th District

Kaitlin Eastman
Richmond, 3rd District

Bradley Armstrong
Richmond, 2nd District

Elizabeth Johnson
Richmond, 2nd District

Jeanna Chapman
Richmond, 4th District

Paul Granger
Richmond, 7th District

Jacob Schroeder
Henrico, Va

Jay Tubb
Henrico, Va

Dean Sayers
Mechanicsville, Va

Sharon Murphy
Chesterfield, Va

Daniel Moss
Midlothian, Va

Brandon Collins
Charlottesville, Va

William Magnant
Doswell, Va

Tyshawn Smithers
Fredericksburg, Va

Lauren Garcia
Laurel, Va

Anthony Casamassima
Henrico, Va

Matthew Conover
Farmville, Va

David Foley
Huntersville, NC

Mei Yang

Yohance Whitaker

Sheila Wier

Community Comments:

"Where would this plan leave me and my five kids to live. How are you all (RRHA) planning on helping us if we do not have the option to move back in. What is the plan I need want and deserve some answers." – Lafonda Page

"The RRHA absolutely should be engaging the community regarding this plan. The city cannot continue to ignore the needs of its most vulnerable populations." – Christopher Romero

"As a former 5th District Councilman and 15 yr., At-Large member of city-wide Tenant Org., this is a massive violation of HUD law. City Council has the authority to correct this and must do so. This is a continuation of Corporates plan to eliminate the City's poor in pursuit of a "tier-one city" and a triple-A bond rating. Please count me in the fight." – Marty Jewell

"Housing justice now." – Jay Tubb

“Our city council should be ashamed.” – James Randall

“NO MASS EVICTIONS!” – Amy Wentz

“We are already mired in a crisis of public faith in its city government, as our Mayor attempts to demolish one neighborhood without input from, and in fact, while hiding public business from his constituents. That RRHA would then attempt to demolish several more neighborhoods, and nearly all of their residents’ homes, with almost no consideration for their well-being, or of their desires, is a betrayal that will deeply wound Richmond and its most vulnerable residents.” – Charles Peters

“Make housing not only affordable, but livable.” – Paige Bailey

“Housing in Richmond is unaffordable and becoming more so with each subsidy the city gives to developers to put up more apartments that do not provide any public benefit. The RRHA plan to force residents into the private market is absurd and will leave people without any options. This is not right and should not stand.” – Suzanne Keller

“RRHA’s organizational culture of avoiding transparency holds the families that it serves hostage to the whims of an organization characterized by unstable leadership and lack of foresight.” – Will Kerner

“The proposed changes will have devastating effects to the families that occupy these homes. More importantly – selling public property to private investors is an obscene injustice. Planning to displace over 1300 housing units worth of people while the 2020-2024 5-year plan allocates relocation funding for less than 300 seems to be at best a massive oversight if not an intentional sabotage used to underscore how the system ‘doesn’t work’ and should be privatized.” – Samuel West

“Quit trying to gentrify the city. Only the rich and dc implants can afford to live in this dump!” – Kaitlin Eastman

“Nobody deserves to have their home demolished without a guaranteed actually-existing replacement. Stop this war on the poor now.” – Adam Steven

July 8, 2019

Damon Duncan
Chief Executive Officer
901 Chamberlayne Parkway
Richmond, Virginia 23220

Mr. Duncan,

Please consider this letter as my public comment on Richmond Redevelopment and Housing Authority's proposed FY 2020 Annual Agency Plan and FY 2020-2024 Five Year Agency Plan. I refer to the 2 plans consolidated as "PHA Plan".

PUBLIC COMMENT

April 4, 1968 brought the assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr, one of our country's most prolific fair housing advocates. One week later President Johnson signed the Civil Rights Act making the Fair Housing Act law. The momentum of progress towards justice carried into the summer with the August 1968 signing of the HUD Act. The HUD Act filled in the racial gaps in opportunity presented by previous Housing Acts and the GI Bill. The provisions for implementation of the HUD Act are codified in Title 24 of the Code of Federal Regulations (CFR). Compliance with Title 24 is therefore a matter of civil rights!

Per 24 CFR 903.3, the PHA Plan is not merely a procedural step for PHAs to cross. The purpose of PHA Plans are to provide local accountability in the strategic planning for PHA management operations and capital planning. It is mandated to be an easily identifiable source for citizens to "locate basic [RRHA] policies, rules and requirements concerning [RRHA's] operations, programs, and services." Local accountability is ensured by a required public input process for PHA Plans which is governed by 24 CFR 903.17. This process is robust and includes public notice, reasonable outreach activities, public review period, consultation with tenants, and a public hearing to discuss the PHA plan. Furthermore after a PHA Plan is approved, any significant changes (also known as "substantial deviation") being proposed to the PHA Plan are subject to these same local accountability guidelines. In addition to ensuring local accountability the PHA Plan public input process also ensures that RRHA residents are "involved and participate in the overall policy development and direction of Public Housing operations" as mandated by 24 CFR 964.135.

RRHA's proposed PHA Plan contains policy changes that can only be interpreted as the Authority actively seeking to evade those federal mandates that ensure local accountability and resident involvement. This is blaringly evident in section B.1 (page 28) of the proposal, as RRHA aims to redefine its definition of "substantial deviation" to narrow its scope. The PHA Plan proposes to alter RRHA's definition of "substantial deviation" such that future demolition of units and conversion to housing choice vouchers would not be included in its definition. This change would suggest that plans to destroy residents' homes could proceed on a whim with tenants being provided vouchers to seek housing where ever their voucher is accepted. With this definition change RRHA administration would not even need to notify its Board of Commissioners much less the rest of the public input process before deciding to demolish units. Reduced accountability and reduced public input do not serve the interests of tenants or the public, and RRHA has offered no good cause as to why this change is necessary.

Historically RRHA has been wrought with mismanagement. This is evidenced in recent years by several punitive fines issued by HUD's Office of Inspector General, delays in redevelopment efforts at "Church Hill North", and a settled class action lawsuit regarding improper utility charges. December 2017 mismanagement led to the RRHA's failure to provide heat to numerous families during single-digit temperatures leading to a humanitarian crisis that affected 3000 public housing units. Subsequently RRHA's president resigned amid intense public pressure from City leaders, who publicly bemoaned the lack of transparency into the organization's operations, and from housing advocates who called for new housing authority leadership to change the culture of resident disenfranchisement at RRHA. It is very apparent that increased accountability and increased oversight is needed at RRHA to ensure that it is lawfully and sufficiently addressing the needs of low-income residents.

My concern is that RRHA administration's widely reported goal to "expeditiously" redevelop neighborhoods in the manner described in this PHA Plan proposal lacks the intention of ensuring adequate housing choice for low-income residents. The City's most recent Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice (AI) states "There is shortage of 15,000 units affordable to households with incomes less than 50% of AMI." The proposed PHA Plan's reliance on issuing vouchers and market-rate unit construction does not effectively address this issue. On the other hand, this approach creates the high probability of mass displacement of residents. As noted in the AI, landlord discrimination against voucher users is high with only 15% of apartment complexes surveyed accepting vouchers in Richmond. Although a marginal increase in voucher accepting units has occurred since the AI was written, if affordable replacement units are not planned along with demolition plans, there is a strong likelihood that many low-income residents would be forced to leave the City in order to find housing. Unfortunately residents would not fair much better in the counties surrounding Richmond according to the AI: "Suburban jurisdictions do not have sufficient undeveloped land designated for multifamily development. Rental demand will then fall disproportionately, as it currently does, on the City."

RRHA's PHA Plan public input process has been severely inadequate. Sometime in May 2019 RRHA published a "Notice of Public Hearing" document announcing that the PHA Plan materials would be available for inspection beginning May 20, 2019 and that a public hearing for the plan would be held June 12, 2019. This 25-day period falls far short of the 45 day minimum that is lawfully required for a public comment period prior to the PHA Plan public hearing. Section A.1 (page 5) of the proposed PHA Plan states that PHA Plan elements can be found at the "Housing Authority Website: <http://www.rrha.com>". The proposed PHA Plan that was retrieved from the website contains numerous changes to policies that are part of RRHA's Admissions and Continued Occupancy Plan (ACOP). Neither the current ACOP nor the proposed ACOP (as PHA Plan elements) were able to be located on the website as purported. It is crucial that all PHA Plan elements be available were RRHA claims that they are. This is especially important for Resident Advisory Board (RAB) members to adequately provide input on the Plan.

Section B.6 (page 59) of the proposed plan contains no comments from the Resident Advisory Board. There is a note instead that states "Presentation of the Annual Plan to RAB to be held May 30, 2019." This means that the Plan was presented to the RAB 10 days after the public input period began. It is evident that the RAB was not thoroughly engaged during the development of the plan. Moreover Richmond Times Dispatch Newspaper's July 7, 2019 issue contains remarks from Gilpin Court's Tenant Council president, as she echoes concerns of fellow residents: "If they tear this down, where am I going to go?" As a sitting member of the Resident Advisory Board (RAB), the Gilpin Court Tenant Council President's comments are concerning, as they indicate that she herself has not been adequately informed of key components of the PHA Plan. This is also an indication that the RAB has not been

granted the opportunity to provide meaningful input during development of the PHA Plan, or else such a question would have been addressed. One can only infer that the majority of Gilpin Court tenants are as much uninformed as the tenant council president. In fact, as I voluntarily conducted outreach activities over several days in Gilpin Court and other RRHA housing complexes, I did not encounter a single individual who was aware of the PHA Plan's existence nor the comment period. RRHA has failed to uphold provisions of 24 CFR 903.13(a) in providing "reasonable resources" such that the RAB can "become informed on programs covered by the PHA Plan, to communicate in writing and by telephone with assisted families and hold meetings with those families, and to access information regarding covered programs on the internet..." I find RRHA to be noncompliant with federal guidelines provided by 24 CFR 903.17 and 24 CFR 903.13(a) in this area of public input.

Lastly the proposed PHA plan does not appear to be consistent with the following community development guidance from the City of Richmond Consolidated Plan:

- "There should be an "inclusive" planning process that is not top-down"
- "evaluation and implementation of creative strategies to create civic engagement and a sense of neighborhood within communities and publicly-assisted housing"
- "Redevelopment of current housing stock should not lead to a net loss of public housing units. Offering Section 8 vouchers to displaced residents while reducing the net number of housing units is not acceptable, because it decreases the supply of affordable housing in the City. It is also unlikely to produce deconcentration of poverty as vouchers are generally only accepted by landlords in high-poverty areas."

My suggestion is that RRHA postpone the finalizing of the PHA Plan so that it may hold a lawful public comment period and begin authentically engaging residents to participate in developing a PHA plan that comports with strategies and recommendations outlined in the City of Richmond 2017-2020 Analysis of Impediments to Fair Housing Choice, City of Richmond 2013 Antipoverty Commission Report, and the City of Richmond 2016-2020 Consolidated Plan. RRHA should adhere to guidance provided by 24 Title 964.140 to provide training for residents on HUD policies, federal rights, and resident management corporations. RRHA should completely remove its planned changes to the definition of "substantial deviation". In the interest of accountability and organizational culture transformation RRHA should take action on the following items that were presented by a coalition of advocates to RRHA administration:

- Evaluation of process for tenant organization elections and determination of status of all tenant organizations
- Inclusion of two community leaders to the Board of Commissioners
- Removal and replacement of all Board members out of compliance with City Council rules on length of time that persons can serve
- Support of community organizations in implementing 964 "Know your rights" trainings.

Thank you for this opportunity to be heard,

Omari Al-Qadaffi

RRHA FY 2020 Annual Plan and FY 2020-2024 Five Year Agency Plan PHA VA 007
Public Comment
July 8, 2019

To: Damon Duncan

Orlando Artze,

By Email Damon.Duncan@rrha.com, Orlando.Artze@rrha.com

My involvement with the RRHA 5year and annual planning process goes back to 1998-9 with the HOPE VI grant when residents and stakeholders, individuals and groups stood up to oppose the way in which the grant was applied. Not to initially oppose redevelopment/ revitalization or whatever urban renewal term of the day used, but to oppose further disadvantages and the loss of the low and very low income housing stock. So the push back began as the grant was not being applied as intended. With the disregard of residents rights (relocation and participation to name a few), the mental and physical harms to the affected residents, the harms (asbestos released ash) of demolition to the environment, and the severe loss of low and very low income housing stock it became apparent that the effects were adverse. Blackwell, I would learn all 400 units of scatter site housing was the model of the concentration the HOPE VI grant aimed to achieve.

Additionally the word (promises of resident participation, home ownership, section 3 opportunities, Eco-friendly homes, just to name a few) and the deed (what actually happened) never met. Just a few of the transgressions outlined in False Hope.

Fast forward to this current annual plan and whats clear is that which each plan the waiting list grows as well as the need for low and very low income housing. However, since the first annual plan, there has been a decrease in the housing authorities portfolio of available housing for low and very low income households.

While I would like to address more of the details in the plan. They aren't online and I have not had the opportunity to review the 2019 Annual Plannings supporting documents. The Plan template is what I'm addressing with my comments.

I wish I had the supporting documents to know how do you get to RAD as a goal for, the housing needs of low income families" given the lack of demonstration or utilization of available wealth building (sec 3). How has the tracking data from HOPE VI not help to leverage sec 3 and the self-sufficiency to the benefit of residents to afford the opportunity of home ownership, that is now being auctioned off to the detriment of the Dove Court

community. Because at this point, home ownership is more economical than renting. And I don't see in the plan how RAD will overcome market rents.

RAD, the conversion to PBV are structured like the market properties of years gone by. If they fell how will RAD differ. Such properties have led to the displacement of 1500 affordable housing units Why is it necessary to place residents in harms way?.

RRHA shuns a fiduciary responsibility Its again clear that RRHA residents will again be adversely affected.

The last two Annual Plans have listed the RAB response as no comment. I note that on page 7 and 59, RRHA states the RAB had "no" comments to the Plan. But on page 18 RRHA list as a reason for strategy for addressing housing needs as, "consultation with residents and the Resident Advisory Board (RAB)." Which was it?

Finally, the notice regarding the CNI application appears to be June 12, while the application deadline was June 10, 2019. How did that make the Plan?

Thanks for the attention given my concerns.

SWeir

copied to regional HUD Office

Comments for RRHA Draft Annual Agency Plan for FY 2020 (October 1, 2019 – September 30, 2020) or Five Year Agency Plan (FY 2020-2024)

Everyone deserves a place to live. please reach into your heart and find your humanity.

I support community-driven solutions within RRHA. In response to the proposed five-year plan, I seek to support and amplify the voices of those living within RRHA who are looking to participate in discussions about the future of the city's housing programs.

As called for by community members directly affected by these decisions, I support "one-to-one" brick and mortar replacement for all housing units during discussions about replacing housing projects. I do not support any effort to remove residents, or the public, from the planning process.

Please "press pause" on this plan and redesign the engagement activity RRHA uses to envision its future. I wish to enter this comment into the public record.

Sincerely,

Submitted by (optional): _____ Casimira Stempniewicz

Comments for RRHA Draft Annual Agency Plan for FY 2020 (October 1, 2019 – September 30, 2020) or Five Year Agency Plan (FY 2020-2024)

I write in support of community-driven solutions within RRHA. In response to the proposed five-year plan, I seek to support and amplify the voices of those living within RRHA who are looking to participate in discussions about the future of the city's housing programs.

As called for by community members directly affected by these decisions, I support "one-to-one" brick and mortar replacement for all housing units during discussions about replacing housing projects. I do NOT support any effort to remove residents, or the public, from the planning process.

Please take time to review and redesign the engagement activity RRHA uses to envision its future.

I would like to enter this comment into the public record.

Sincerely,

Submitted by (optional): _____ Susan Barstow (Richmond resident)

1521 Hanover Avenue

Richmond, VA 23220

Comments for RRHA Draft Annual Agency Plan for FY 2020 (October 1, 2019 – September 30, 2020) or Five Year Agency Plan (FY 2020-2024)

As an Age Wave community member, I support community-driven solutions within RRHA. In response to the proposed five-year plan, I seek to support and amplify the voices of those living within RRHA who are looking to participate in discussions about the future of the city's housing programs.

As called for by community members directly affected by these decisions, I join Age Wave in supporting "one-to-one" brick and mortar replacement for all housing units during discussions about replacing housing projects. I do not support any effort to remove residents, or the public, from the planning process.

Please "press pause" on this plan and redesign the engagement activity RRHA uses to envision its future. Please recognize that the way RRHA is currently proceeding, without clear plans to keep housing secure and guaranteed is causing unacceptable turmoil and trauma in our community. I wish to enter this comment into the public record.

Sincerely,

Submitted by (optional): _____ Mari Lee Mifsud, PhD

Professor of Rhetoric and Women, Gender, and Sexuality Studies

University of Richmond

mmifsud@richmon.edu